

## II. REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 7, and 15 have been amended. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-8, 11-13, 15-16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Shi et al. (US patent no 5,875,296), hereafter "Shi." Claims 9-10, 14, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shi. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons stated below.

### A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-8, 11-13, 15-16, AND 18-19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action, claims 1-8, 11-13, 15-16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Shi et al. (US patent no 5,875,296), hereafter Shi. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); see MPEP § 2131, p. 2100-70. Applicants respectfully submit that Shi does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Specifically, applicants respectfully submit that Shi fails to disclose an element of a web page that is an embedded element of said web page. The Office incorrectly equates the file in a

Distributed Computing Environment (DCE) of Shi with the element of a web page that is displayed as an embedded element of said web page as included in the present invention. The DCE environment in Shi is a file server environment in which multiple users access resources and process applications in a distributed environment. Col. 1, line 26-33. The DCE environment in Shi has a robust security mechanism to prevent unauthorized access to the network resources. Col. 1, line 39-42. As a result, all files in a DCE system as used in Shi are protected against unauthorized use. Conversely, the verification method as claimed in the present invention verifies that a parent web site has been accessed before it will allow access to the embedded child web site. This is clearly not equivalent to the verification in Shi, where the authorization to use a file is not dependent upon whether a specific parent file has been previously accessed. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the Office is in error in stating that Shi discloses storing an indicator in response to a request from a client for a web page hosted by a web server. In Shi, the indicator is stored only after a user has logged in to the network. Col. 8, line 32-46. FIG. 4. The authentication method in Shi requires a user to log in using a user id and password before the user can get any data from the system. Col. 8, line 47-51. Shi does not disclose a verification method in which no initial login occurs. Conversely, in order to access the element of a web page as included in the present invention, a user must access the web page into which the element is embedded. The login in Shi is clearly not equivalent to the step of accessing a parent web page as provided in the present invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

**B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 9, 10, 14, 17, and 20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Office Action, claims 9, 10, 14, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shi. Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to independent claims 1, 7, and 15 from which claims 9, 10, 14, 17, and 20 depend. In particular, since Shi does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 1, 7, and 15, Shi also fails to teach all the limitations of the dependent claims 9, 10, 14, 17, and 20. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

### III. CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary to place the application in better condition for allowance, he is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald A. D'Alessandro  
Reg. No. 42,456

Date: June 4, 2004

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
Three E-Comm Square  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044  
(518) 449-0047 (fax)